

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-13 and 15 are pending in this application. Claims 8 and 14 have been canceled and their subject matter inserted into allowable claims 1 and independent claim 15 which should also be allowable.

In order to distinguish the amended claim 9 from the cited Ueyoko reference claim 9 has been amended to provide that the first linear portion and second linear portion are absolutely straight and such absolutely straight first linear portion is presented as having a considerable length.

The rejection of claims 9-13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueyoko (US 5,772,811) is respectfully traversed. The difference between the Ueyoko patent and the claimed invention is that the Ueyoko fails to describe an embodiment in which the carcass is within a distance of 0.5 times a quantity "gt" from a point Q. Furthermore, the Examiner states that the applicant has failed to provide any unexpected results to establish a criticality for the claimed range wherein the embodiments in table 1 have either a relevant distance of 0/mm or a relevant distance of 4 times "gt". In the specification at page 15, Table 1 sets forth the results of testing and compares the test results for the examples in the specification of tires made according to the claims

with other tires for a reference. The results are discussed in the specification from page 11 through page 15. It appears from the results that the tires made according to the present application are superior in weight, bead, durability and crack resistance as can be seen from the examples in the specification. The tires according to these examples have lowered tire weight and higher bead durability and better crack resistance than the tires of the prior art. In view of these differences it is respectfully suggested that the claims according to claims 9-13 are patentable over the prior art. It is seen that the prior art Ueyoko fails to expressly describe an embodiment in which the carcass turn up end point is within a distance of 0.5 times a quantity "gt" from a point Q.

It is noted that claims 1-7 and 15 have been allowed.

In view of the foregoing arguments and amendments reconsideration of the rejection of claims 9-13 is respectfully requested and favorable action respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner wish to contact the applicants representative in the Washington metropolitan area, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Edward H. Valance (Reg. No. 19,896) at the telephone number of the undersigned below

Appl. No. 09/962,699

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Joseph A. Kolasch, #22,463

JAK/*fat*:trb
0229-0612P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment(s)